

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/713,697	THURM, KENNETH R.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Gerald B. Klebe	3618	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Gerald B. Klebe / Examiner, AU 3618. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Michael Nornberg, Reg No. 46502, Att'y for Applicant. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 23 March 2005.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: Independent claim 1, dependent claims 7 and 16.

Identification of prior art discussed: Leib et al. US 5340145; Albert US 5570898.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Refer to attached sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

*G B Klebe*  
*23 March 2005*

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Examiner's signature, if required

## Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

### Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

### Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

#### Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

#### 37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,  
(The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

### Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

*Case S/N 10/713697*

*Interview Summary - Attachment in Reference to Substance of the Telephone Interview of  
03/23/2005*


The Attorney for Applicant, Mr. M. Nornberg Reg. No. 46502 called the examiner to discuss the substance of Applicant's Remarks accompanying the amendment filed 02/07/2005 in response to the Office Action mailed 11/29/2004. In particular, the Attorney discussed and took issue with the rejections of claims made under 35 § USC 102 based upon the prior art of Leib et al. (US 5340145). In the Remarks of the amendment and in the interview the Applicant and the Attorney took issue with certain features of Leib et al. (-145) that were relied upon in the rejections of the Office Action. In particular, issue was taken with the examiner's use of the planar structures of the rail comprised of 62 and 44 to meet the claim limitations of a planar deck substantially covering the first upper platform of the trailer and the examiner's position that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to have modified the trailer of Leib to have made the guide rail and wheel chock assembly removably attached to the first upper platform. In the discussion of these points the examiner maintained his position in opposition to the Applicant's arguments to the contrary. Regarding the feature of claim 7 as amended to recite that the wheel chock is pivotable, the examiner agreed that Leib et al. (-145) appeared not to have this feature, the wheel chock of Leib (-145) admittedly being fixed. Regarding the amendment to claim 16 wherein it is recited that the platform provides a flat bed platform having no voids disposed through the flat bed platform, the examiner could not find adequate support for this feature in the disclosure as originally filed. The Attorney argued that this feature is shown in the

Art Unit: 3618

Figures, citing Figures 1 and 2. The examiner disagreed taking the position that the feature in these figures alluded to by the Attorney as being a [closed] seam could as readily be interpreted as being an opening between the front and rear plates since there was no support in the specification supporting these features as being without voids. Further discussion addressed seeming inconsistencies in the features of the frame shown in Figure 3A to attach the plates to the frame. No agreement was reached.

Regarding the limitation of the claims that recited a first planar deck substantially covering the first upper platform, the examiner brought up the prior art of record due to Albert (-898) which could be used in combination with Leib to make a rejection under 35 USC 103 of the independent claim. The Attorney seemed to agree that this could conceivably be made but reserved agreement until the rejection was officially made in writing.

The interview ended amicably but with no agreement on claim language that would yield allowance; the examiner would proceed with prosecution addressing the official written amendment filed 02/07/2005.

 GbKlebe / Art Unit 3618 / 03/23/2005